01	01		
02	02		
03	03		
04	04		
05	05		
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
07	AT SEATTLE		
08	08 MICHAEL FRANCIS MOYNIHAN, JR., ) CASE N	О. С11-1786-МЈР-МАТ	
09	Plaintiff,		
10	v. , repor	Γ AND RECOMMENDATION	
11	2ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT,		
12	Defendant.		
13	13		
14	On November 2, 2011, the Court denied pro se plaintiff Michael Francis Moynihan,		
15	Jr.'s application to proceed ("IFP") with his civil complaint based on having three "strikes"		
16	under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and directed him to pay the \$350 filing fee to proceed with this		
17	lawsuit. (Dkt. 5.) Shortly thereafter, the Court received a letter from Mr. Moynihan in which		
18	he requested that all deadlines be stayed until he has access to his legal files. (Dkt. 6.) He did		
19	not discuss why lack of access to legal files would prevent him from paying the \$350 filing fee.		
20	He did, however, provide a new mailing address that, coupled with mail returned as		
21	undeliverable, suggests he is no longer incarcerated in Snohomish County Jail and is living in a		
22	multi-occupancy home in North Bend. The Court recommends <b>DENYING</b> as moot Mr.		
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE -1		

Moynihan's request to stay this action (Dkt. 6) because, having reviewed Mr. Moynihan's 01 02 complaint, the Court recommends **DISMISSING** this matter with prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). 03 04 Mr. Moynihan seeks to bring a Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") action against 05 defendant 2nd Congressional District so that defendant will disclose information about itself 06 and Congressman Rick Larsen. (Dkt. 1-1.) No cause of action lies under FOIA against the 07 2nd Congressional District. FOIA applies only to agencies of the executive branch of the 08 United States government. 5 U.S.C. §§ 551(1), 552(f); see Moore v. United Kingdom, 384 F.3d 09 1079, 1089 (9th Cir. 2004). No amendment of Mr. Moynihan's complaint will cure this fatal 10 pleading deficiency. See Lucas v. Dep't of Corrections, 66 F.3d 245, 248 (9th Cir. 1995) (per 11 curiam) (holding that a pro se litigant should be afforded the opportunity to amend the complaint unless "it is absolutely clear that no amendment can cure the defect"). A proposed 12 13 order is attached. 14 DATED this 17th day of November, 2011. 15 16 United States Magistrate Judge 17 18 19 20 21

22